

REMARKS

Claims 1 – 20 are now pending in the application. The amendments to the claims made herein are intended to more particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter regarded as the invention and thus are not narrowing amendments. The Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw the rejections in view of the amendments and remarks contained herein.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1 – 20 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Brotherston (WO 00/63806) in view of Arazi et al. (2001/0041594). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

It is first submitted that Brotherston does not disclose a motivation for, or point out the desirability of, the features claimed in the present invention. Brotherston is directed to a different, and less challenging problem than that being addressed by the present invention. The present invention seeks to prevent unauthorized users from continuing use of Internet services. Brotherston, on the other hand, is concerned with providing a means for consumers to customize the services they receive without interactions with representatives from the consumer service provider.

Furthermore, Brotherston discloses completely blocking access to a computer network by all users, as may be necessary during certain operations of a transportation vessel, such as an airplane during takeoff. This does not contemplate the ability to selectively block unauthorized users, while allowing access for other users, as the

present invention does. Brotherston simply does not teach or suggest this feature, and this feature is not taught or suggested by Arazi et al. Thus, one of ordinary skill in this art, viewing Brotherston and Arazi et al., would not have recognized any suggestion from these two references to implement a system that selectively blocks only unauthorized users from accessing the Internet services, let alone know how this feature would be implemented. Amended claim 1 specifically recites a device "...such that access to the wide area network services by the network device may be selectively blocked." Independent claims 12 and 19 have been similarly amended.

It is therefore respectfully submitted that the combination of Brotherston with Arazi et al. does not render the invention obvious. Additionally, claims 2 – 11, 13 – 18, and 20 depend from claims 1, 12, and 19, respectively. Thus, Applicants assert that these claims are in condition for allowance for the reasons set forth above regarding claims 1, 12, and 19. In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, reconsideration and withdrawal of the outstanding rejections is respectfully requested.


CONCLUSION

It is believed that all of the stated grounds of rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicant therefore respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw all presently outstanding rejections. It is believed that a full and complete response has been made to the outstanding Office Action, and as such, the present application is in condition for allowance. Thus, prompt and favorable consideration of this amendment is respectfully requested. If the

Examiner believes that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at (248) 641-1600.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: April 22, 2005

By: 
Mark D. Elchuk
Reg. No. 33,686

HARNESS, DICKEY & PIERCE, P.L.C.
P.O. Box 828
Bloomfield Hills, Michigan 48303
(248) 641-1600

MDE/sdo